health and when they from their traditional habits—call it conservatism if you like—think that it is rice that they want why should your paternal feelings go to the extent of forcing down his throat something which he does not like to swallow and that after taking money from him. It unfortunately stands unanswered. But with what I saw from this side of House which I did not expect I do not want to show the public the real picture and therefore I seek leave of the House to withdraw my motion.

Cut Motion by leave withdrawn

Demand put and carried

94. Rs. 645 under "39 (3)—Price Control Measures—Dearness Allowance

95. Rs. 900 under "39 (3)—Price Control Measures—Travelling Allowance"

Rao Sahib M. M. Paul *(Director of Food Supplies):* Sir, I rise to move for an additional allotments of Rs. 645 under "39 (3)—Price Control Measures—Dearness Allowance" and Rs. 900 under "39 (3)—Price Control Measures—Travelling Allowance". On account of the various measures adopted by the Government for popularisation of dry grains and to relieve the food situation in the State an amount of Rs. 645 is required under "Dearness Allowance" and Rs. 900 under "Travelling Allowance". I request that the House may be pleased to grant the allotments.

Demands put and carried

96. Rs. 35,943 under "39 (3)—Price Control Measures Other charges

Rao Sahib M. M. Paul *(Director of Food Supplies):* Sir, I rise to move for an additional allotment of Rs. 35,943, under "39 (3)—Price Control Measures—Other charges". This additiional allotment is necessitated on account of various measures adopted by the Governmen for the popularisation of dry grains and to relieve the food situation in the State namely opening of the Cochin Restaurants, Standard Meal Hotels, Standard Meat Restaurants and propaganda and advertisement. This amount is mainly required to pay subsidies to restaurants. I request that the House may be pleased to grant the allotment.

Mr. President: Mr. Ezhuthassan has tabled a cut motion. I am very doubtful whether it is in order. Although I did not hear the Hon'ble Member well I understood him to say that this Rs. 35,943 was mainly required to pay subsidies to restaurants. I don't think a discussion on Fair Price Shops will be in order on that supplementary demand. But I am prepared to hear the Hon'ble Member.

CUT MOTION

Mr.P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* I do not wish to move that motion.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* Sir, I am not opposing the demand as a whole. But as regards the subsidy to Cochin Restaurants I think it is an absolute waste. The Hon'ble Member for Food Supplies has already been able to establish that we have become a wheat eating population and that wheat and other dry grains which have been imported into the State during the food crisis have been assimilated by the people so that there is no necessity at all for these grains to be popularised in future by the restaurants now run by the Government. If that is so, Sir, if the purpose of these restaurants is not to popularise the exotic products the only other purpose, according to me is that there should be certain institutions in the State which should be entering to the public at reasonably normal rates. Now, Sir, most of these restaurants are conducting their business and selling their wares at rates which approximate rates of any other institution which is not subsidised by the Government and that being so there is no reason at all why the Cochin Restaurants have to be given an extra subsidy. Therefore my submission is that it logically follows that there is no meaning at all in subsidising these institutions. Therefore, Sir, to the extent to which this particular demand contemplates a subsidy to the restaurants I very vehemently oppose it.

*Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Sir, I also oppose that portion of the demand relating to subsidy to restaurants. As stated by my Hon'ble friend, in the prices obtaining in these restaurants and in the adjoining shops privately owned there is not much difference. If there is not much difference, then for the reasons stated by my friend we cannot certainly see our way to vote for this grant for giving subsidy. Naturally, a man goes in for

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

a business expecting and almost always realising a decent margin of profit. By the side of the restaurants we have the private dealer, perhaps dealings in things which people relish more. For example, in a coffee club adjoining the restaurant we can get preparations in rice while in the restaurant we get only wheat preparations, whether they be more healthy or not. So in the adjoining private shop we get things which are relished by the public at the same rate. Apart from the question of subsidy that is proposed to be given through this grant there is this extra advantage to the restaurant-keeper which the other shop keeper has not. All sorts of controlled articles they get in plenty and whenever they want while the other man does not get them. The Cochin Restaurant gets sugar in plenty. Now, for the purchase of 1 cwt. of sugar you have to purchase so many cwts. of wheat. Even by purchasing so many cwts. of wheat to entitle him to get 1 cwt. of sugar he is a gainer because he gets sufficient quantity of sugar which the other man does not get. So the restaurant-keeper is at a decided advantage over the private shop-keeper.

Again, Sir, in the quantity of things that are given, and in the quality of things that are given, between the starting days and the present day there is a difference. Those who have resorted to these restaurants in the days when they were started and those who go there now can understand what I mean. The size of the various preparations, the quality of the various preparations, have all deteriorated in spite of the remarks that we get from hon'ble persons who come here and are taken round these places. In spite of that, the experience of normal days apart from these particular days is that the quantity and quality have gone done. But the price has not. So there is absolutely no necessity for granting this subsidy to these restaurants.

* **Mr. C. V. Iyyu** *(Kunnamkulam):* Sir, I support the idea of stopping the subsidy, but I must differentiate to this extent. The Hon'ble Member for Vadakkancheri was pleased to say that those resturant-keepers who do not get subsidy could sell articles made of rice and that is more relished by the people. That ought to be stopped. Of course, the Government can very well use for such good things the Defence of India Act and Rules thereunder. Issue an order that no coffee club shall expose or sell any sweet meat made of rice. It must be made of wheat and they may be given sufficient quantity of sugar also and good variety of jaggery also for their use. If such a rule can be brought into force I think the whole problem can be solved and all this amount of subsidy can be saved. Of course, in such things we must take up the policy of the Doctors. Some people may not like milk. I have personal experience of my mother. She did not like milk. I forced her to take milk. In the interests of those whom we love we must make them take things which they do not like. Some people may not like bitter medicines. Wheat eating must be made compulsory in all restaurants. There must be a special legislation for that and subsidy should be stopped. It is more than two years since we have had this propaganda and people have begun to like dry grains. I am of opinion that this subsidy should be stopped.

Rao Sahib M. M. Paul *(Director of Food Supplies):* Sir, the first argument was there is no difference in the price of articles served in these restaurants and of those in the other neighbouring shops. It is necessary now to go back to the days when we started these restaurants, was at a time when the price of these articles went abnormally high that these restaurants were started. When the restaurants were started the Government fixed a rate for each of these articles and when they began to sell at these control rates the other shop-keepers had to sell them at those rates. The moment we come away the old order of things would come back.

Then as regards subsidy, as was remarked by the Hon'ble Memer for Vadakkancheri, people generally go to shops where some preparation of rice can be had. Unless some financial assistance is given to these shops where rice preparations are not allowed, it is not likely that very many reliable people will come forward to undertake this. In order to popularise wheat it is necessary to taboo rice preparations. That is why this subsidy is given. Except in one or two towns the subsidy is very small. These restaurants are opened in centres where there is real necessity for it. It was said in the course of the discussion that we have become a wheat eating population, and so this subsidy is not necessary. That is exactly the opposite of what I submitted to this House, We have not yet come to that stage. It is necessary that we should make the small concessions that we are now giving.

Then the complaint was that some preference was being shown in the matter of issue of controlled articles. Of course, some preference is shown there. That is because there is greater supervision and check over these institutions. *(A voice: Question).* There is no use of

* Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

questioning facts. Our officers are supervising and there is a greater guarantee under the ordinary conditions that these articles will be used for the purpose for which they are intended.

Lastly the attack was that the quality of the stuff has deteriorated. Unless instances are given I cannot effectively answer. I do not concede it, but join issue with the Hon'ble Member for Vadakkancheri in this point.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* May I know, Sir, whether it is possible to split it up, the subsidy and the other things? May I know how much of this amount represents subsidy?

Rao Sahib M. M. Paul *(Director of Food Supplies):* Rs. 15,939.

Mr. President: I think it is proper to move motion as a reduction the allotmen by that amount.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* I move that the grant be reduced by Rs. 15,900 representing the amount given as subsidy to the Cochin Restaurants.

Cut Motion put and lost

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* A poll, Sir,

Ayes

1. Mr. C. V. Iyyu	2. Mr. Ephraim Ouseph
3. Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar	4. Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon.
5. Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan	6. Mr. C. K. Nayar
7. Mr. K. Kunhirama Menon	8. Mr. K. Narayana Menon
9. Mr. Thomas Karikkasseri	10. Mr. C. K. S. Moni

Noes

1. Mr. K. T. Achuthan	2. Mr. K. S. Panickar
3. Mr. A. B. Salem	4. Rao Sahib K. Ayyappan
5. Mr. K. M. Ibrahim	6. Mr. George Panikulam
7. Mr. N. V. Subbarayan Chettiar	8. Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu
9. Rama Varmha Tampuran	10. Mr. M. Sivarama Menon
11. Mr. B. V. K. Menon	12. Mr. C. J. Mathew
13. Khan Shib Y. M. Roshan Sahib Bahadur	14. Mr. S. Venkateswaran
15. Rao Sahib M. M. Paul	16. Mr. P. V. Raphael.
17. Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon	18. Rao Sahib I. N. Menon
19. Rao Sahib Dr. T. Verghese	

Mr. President: 10 for the motion and 19 against. The motion is lost

Demand put and carried

97. Rs. 41,108 under "39-3 (a)—Food Supplies—Establishment"

98. Rs. 6,465 under "39-3 (a)—Food Supplies—Dearness Allowance"

99. Rs. 22,500 under "39-3 (a)—Food Supplies—Travelling Allowance"

100. Rs. 1,16,513 under "39-3 (a)—Food Supplies—Other Charges"

Rao Sahib M. M. Paul *(Director of Food Supplies):* Sir, I rise to move for additional allotments of Rs. 41, 108 under "39-3 (a)—Food Supplies—Establishment", Rs. 6,465 under "39-3 (a)—Food Supplies—Dearness Allowance", Rs. 22,500 under "39-3 (a)—Food Supplies —Travelling Allowance", and Rs. 1,16,513 under "39-3 (a)—Food Supplies—Other Charges".

The additional expenditure is required consequent on the additional hands sanctioned for the Department. Numerous additional clerks and officers were sanctioned. I request that the House may be pleased to grant the allotments.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* There was a cut motion that was not considered proper under the previous head. I remember, Sir, from my notes to have sent this cut motion under the head "Establishment Charges".

Mr. President: From the file it is seen otherwise. The Hon'ble Member has no right whatever to question the correctness of the statement without being certain of his facts.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly